

CLUSTER: EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION

OBJECTIVE: Evaluation of Early Childhood Special Education services both from the perspective of appropriate services in the least restrictive environment (LRE) and cost effectiveness.

RELATED MISSOURI PERFORMANCE GOAL(S):

The performance level of children who receive special education services prior to age five will increase on the School Entry Profile.

Notes:

- This cluster is not required for the Continuous Improvement Monitoring process (CIMP). Missouri chose to look at this topic as a means of evaluating Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) services in the state.
- Related professional development is listed under the indicators. For descriptions of the professional development, please refer to the Comprehensive System of Professional Development section.
- General notes about the data analyzed in this report can be found in the Data Explanations section.

Overview Answer for the Cluster: Missouri chose to look at this cluster as a means of evaluating Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) services both from the perspective of appropriate services in the least restrictive environment (LRE) and cost effectiveness. This report reflects the preliminary review of data and other information. Additional review will determine if the data provided is accurate and reliable, and if it appropriately addresses the component/indicator. During that process, it is likely that additional or more appropriate indicators will be identified.

Strengths for the Cluster: Throughout this self-assessment process, more itinerant services were identified in Missouri than was originally assumed. The School Entry Assessment provides data that is not available in other states. Missouri's percent of three to five-year-olds being served in special education is equal to national percents. Project Access is a valuable resource for technical training on providing services to children with autism.

Areas of Concern for the Cluster: There are still many unknowns about early childhood programs in Missouri. Additional and better data is needed on all aspects of Early Childhood Special Education in order to better identify areas of concern including more accurate data regarding participation in regular education in early childhood programs. There is also a need for additional monitoring items specific to early childhood.

Other Comments for the Cluster: Committee recommendations for continuing to evaluate and improve Missouri's Early Childhood programs include:

Suggestions for improving data accuracy and funding policies:

- Establish pilot sites to determine if updated data reporting and funding changes are feasible
- Analyze identified barriers and develop strategies for assisting districts in increasing services to children in regular preschool settings.

Suggestions for improving technical assistance:

- Continue to update and disseminate statewide information on effective practices in ECSE including regular updating of some version of Sharing Effective Practices and the Show Me How Manual
- Develop guidelines in the areas of exploring and defining placement options, including training and support for determining individualized placements in the least restrictive environment (LRE). The ECSE in the LRE training should be expedited.
- Establish ongoing dialogue among personnel at DESE (Special Education, Early Childhood, Title I) and school administrators as well as partners such as Head Start to provide leadership and guidance on issues related to providing appropriate services to preschool children including children with disabilities.

Suggestions for ensuring high quality programs:

- Consider a longitudinal study that would facilitate the gathering of data on child outcomes in Missouri.

Suggestions for supporting continuous professional development:

- Define ECSE program goals and priorities (e.g. related to increased inclusion and/or quality of services) and, as DESE sets priorities for training throughout the state, share with districts those priorities and how they were reached, and also provide technical assistance to districts to assure district goals and DESE goals are aligned
- Encourage the use of information from compliance monitoring and the analysis of program statistics while continuing to support districts as they address local needs
- Increase participation in parent education and support systems and expand preschool opportunities as outlined in the new DESE Strategic Plan.

COMPONENT EC.1: Recommendations for a) changes in DESE policies that guide ECSE funding decisions related to service delivery models that districts may establish and for b) changes in caseload parameters.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																																				
<p>EC.1.1: What do we know about preschool options that are available to each school district (designed primarily for children without disabilities e.g. Head Start, Title I preschools, Missouri Preschool Project (MPP), district operated preschools)? What do we know about the extent of usage of these programs by districts that have them available in their areas?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Missouri Preschool Projects (MPP) approved through DESE 1999-2000 (Core Data report and list from Early Childhood web site and final report)Title I child count 2000-01 and districts with Title I preschool programsPartial list of locations of Head Start classrooms throughout MissouriECSE placement data	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p>Since the passage of Senate Bill 740 which required school districts to provide Early Childhood Special Education to eligible three and four year olds effective 1991, the options for providing services to preschool age children in “regular education” settings has increased.</p> <p>For example, in 1990, 57 districts used Title I funding to provide preschool programs and this number has increased to 178 in 2001. Data also indicates that ten districts provided district funded or tuition-based preschools in 1990 and the number is now fourteen. It is suspected that these programs have been very under-reported in the past and continue to be under-reported, so the numbers are probably higher, and we would anticipate that there would still be an increase since 1990.</p> <p>Also, Missouri legislators passed House Bill 1519, establishing the Early Childhood Development Education and Care Fund in 1998. DESE’s portion of these funds is used to provide early care and education services to three and four year old children in Missouri.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Summary Chart of Early Childhood Preschool Programs</p> <table><tr><th></th><th>Number of preschool programs statewide</th><th>Number of districts currently using this program</th><th>Number of children in program</th><th>Number of children with disabilities participating</th><th>Number of children with disabilities that have IEPs implemented in this setting</th></tr><tr><td>Missouri Preschool Project (MPP)</td><td>161</td><td></td><td></td><td>450</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Head Start</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Title I</td><td>178 Districts</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Licensed Childcare Providers (excludes MPP licensed providers)</td><td>3,933</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Locally Funded/Tuition-Based</td><td>14</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>		Number of preschool programs statewide	Number of districts currently using this program	Number of children in program	Number of children with disabilities participating	Number of children with disabilities that have IEPs implemented in this setting	Missouri Preschool Project (MPP)	161			450		Head Start						Title I	178 Districts					Licensed Childcare Providers (excludes MPP licensed providers)	3,933					Locally Funded/Tuition-Based	14				
	Number of preschool programs statewide	Number of districts currently using this program	Number of children in program	Number of children with disabilities participating	Number of children with disabilities that have IEPs implemented in this setting																																
Missouri Preschool Project (MPP)	161			450																																	
Head Start																																					
Title I	178 Districts																																				
Licensed Childcare Providers (excludes MPP licensed providers)	3,933																																				
Locally Funded/Tuition-Based	14																																				

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>EC.1.1: Concluded</p>	<p>Overhead transparencies have been prepared to illustrate the locations of Title I, Missouri Preschool Project (MPP) and known district-funded or tuition-based preschools in Missouri. Head Start data will be added when received. The transparencies show that based on data gathered at this point, there are six counties and large portions of at least fifteen other counties that do not have Title I, MPP or district preschools. The maps do not illustrate the non-MPP licensed childcare facilities.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: The chart above is incomplete. When all data have been compiled, we will have a better picture of the options and availability of early childhood services in Missouri. We have fairly good information about the numbers and locations of settings that offer potential sites for providing special education and related services to eligible preschool aged children and, in some cases, we have information about numbers of children with disabilities who attend these programs. Complete data on Head Start preschool locations is still needed in addition to better information on number of districts with non-funded (tuition-based and district funded) preschools.</p> <p>We do not have data about the extent of usage of MPP preschool programs, Head Start, Title I, Community Preschools, or District funded/tuition-based preschools as a location for the provision of special education services. It would be helpful to know total numbers of children with disabilities who attend each of these programs, the numbers who receive their special education services there, and the number of districts currently using each program as a location for provision of ESCE services.</p> <p>Early Childhood Special Education placement data is not a satisfactory source of information about the location of ECSE services because placement for children who receive itinerant services in a Head Start, Title I, community preschool, etc. is only categorized as early childhood setting if it has been determined an early childhood setting is required in order to implement the IEP. So, many children who receive services in regular early childhood settings are reflected under the "Individual" category along with children who receive individual or small group services in the school from a speech therapist or ECSE teacher. In addition, there has been confusion among lead agency (LEA) personnel about how to record educational placement for ECSE, so there is a great deal of inconsistency in reporting practices.</p> <p>Suggested improvements include making service delivery options and placement options clear so that information reported in each service delivery category and placement option is consistent across districts. ECSE reporting formats could be updated to provide the appropriate information necessary to analyze service delivery and placement data and provide accurate data in District Profiles and Core Data information.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>EC.1.2: What are the barriers preventing districts from using these preschool options when they are available in their areas (through itinerant/consultative services or cooperative preschool programs such as blended Title I/ECSE)?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) cluster subcommittee 	<p>Data Summary: The committee's review of anecdotal data identified the following major barriers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reluctance to hold space throughout the school year for potential students with developmental delays with or without funding to cover these guaranteed slots Inability to provide services in religiously affiliated preschools Logistics related to the preschool's schedule and the student's optimal time for learning and ECSE and preschool staff's availability for consultation and collaboration Some districts are struggling with meeting the challenge of providing services in the least restrictive environment, which has been further defined and emphasized in the reauthorization of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Itinerant services require additional staff and there is a shortage of qualified staff in many parts of the state. Lack of focus on staff development in the area of itinerant services at the state, local or pre-service levels. <p>Committee Conclusions: Districts are not necessarily unwilling to provide itinerant services, but they need various types of support to overcome the barriers and perceived barriers to do so. More information is needed on perceived barriers that prevent districts from using regular preschool options when they are available and barriers to seeking grants or establishing tuition-based or district funded preschools. Information on barriers could be gathered from early childhood special education administrators utilizing surveys and/or focus groups.</p>
<p>EC.1.3: What are the barriers preventing districts from applying for Missouri Preschool Project (MPP) grants or offering district funded or tuition-based preschools?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Input from ECSE CIMP cluster 	<p>Data Summary: Limited space and funding prevents districts from operating or expanding their own preschool programs.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: No conclusions were drawn. Appropriate questions could be included in surveys and/or focus groups noted above.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																																																																																																	
<p>EC.1.4: What do we know about the extent of usage of the service delivery models (classroom, itinerant, contractual)?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• State 618 data• Annual Report to Congress• ECSE Web Application data• Input from ECSE CIMP Cluster Committee and DESE Special Education staff	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Early Childhood Special Education Placements</p> <table><tr><th></th><th colspan="2">1999-2000</th><th colspan="2">2000-2001</th><th colspan="2">2001-2002</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>#</th><th>%</th><th>#</th><th>%</th><th>#</th><th>%</th></tr><tr><td>Home</td><td>362</td><td>4.69%</td><td>327</td><td>4.07%</td><td>302</td><td>3.35%</td></tr><tr><td>Itinerant - Outside the Home</td><td>1,150</td><td>14.89%</td><td>1,112</td><td>13.84%</td><td>1,743</td><td>19.35%</td></tr><tr><td>Early Childhood Setting</td><td>1,944</td><td>25.17%</td><td>1,959</td><td>24.38%</td><td>1,741</td><td>19.33%</td></tr><tr><td>EC Special Education Setting</td><td>3,581</td><td>46.36%</td><td>3,913</td><td>48.69%</td><td>4,493</td><td>49.88%</td></tr><tr><td>Separate School</td><td>410</td><td>5.31%</td><td>343</td><td>4.27%</td><td>233</td><td>2.59%</td></tr><tr><td>PT EC / PT ECSE Setting</td><td>274</td><td>3.55%</td><td>375</td><td>4.67%</td><td>486</td><td>5.40%</td></tr><tr><td>Residential Facility</td><td>4</td><td>0.05%</td><td>7</td><td>0.09%</td><td>9</td><td>0.10%</td></tr><tr><td>Total Early Childhood:</td><td>7,725</td><td>100.00%</td><td>8,036</td><td>100.00%</td><td>9,007</td><td>100.00%</td></tr></table> <p>Counts in above table represent numbers on December 1.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Percentage of Children Ages 3-5 Served in Different Educational Environments Under IDEA, Part B During the 1999-2000 School Year**</p> <table><tr><th></th><th>Missouri</th><th>50 States, DC and PR*</th></tr><tr><td>Early Childhood Setting</td><td>43.47</td><td>36.14</td></tr><tr><td>Early Childhood Special Education Setting</td><td>36.90</td><td>34.01</td></tr><tr><td>Home</td><td>3.39</td><td>3.64</td></tr><tr><td>PT Early Childhood/Special Education Setting</td><td>1.08</td><td>12.86</td></tr><tr><td>Residential Facility</td><td>0.02</td><td>0.14</td></tr><tr><td>Separate School</td><td>4.39</td><td>4.39</td></tr><tr><td>Itinerant Services Outside Home</td><td>10.76</td><td>7.13</td></tr><tr><td>Reverse Mainstream</td><td>-</td><td>1.69</td></tr></table> <p>*Excludes Texas and the District Of Columbia **Data includes kindergarten numbers.</p>		1999-2000		2000-2001		2001-2002			#	%	#	%	#	%	Home	362	4.69%	327	4.07%	302	3.35%	Itinerant - Outside the Home	1,150	14.89%	1,112	13.84%	1,743	19.35%	Early Childhood Setting	1,944	25.17%	1,959	24.38%	1,741	19.33%	EC Special Education Setting	3,581	46.36%	3,913	48.69%	4,493	49.88%	Separate School	410	5.31%	343	4.27%	233	2.59%	PT EC / PT ECSE Setting	274	3.55%	375	4.67%	486	5.40%	Residential Facility	4	0.05%	7	0.09%	9	0.10%	Total Early Childhood:	7,725	100.00%	8,036	100.00%	9,007	100.00%		Missouri	50 States, DC and PR*	Early Childhood Setting	43.47	36.14	Early Childhood Special Education Setting	36.90	34.01	Home	3.39	3.64	PT Early Childhood/Special Education Setting	1.08	12.86	Residential Facility	0.02	0.14	Separate School	4.39	4.39	Itinerant Services Outside Home	10.76	7.13	Reverse Mainstream	-	1.69
	1999-2000		2000-2001		2001-2002																																																																																													
	#	%	#	%	#	%																																																																																												
Home	362	4.69%	327	4.07%	302	3.35%																																																																																												
Itinerant - Outside the Home	1,150	14.89%	1,112	13.84%	1,743	19.35%																																																																																												
Early Childhood Setting	1,944	25.17%	1,959	24.38%	1,741	19.33%																																																																																												
EC Special Education Setting	3,581	46.36%	3,913	48.69%	4,493	49.88%																																																																																												
Separate School	410	5.31%	343	4.27%	233	2.59%																																																																																												
PT EC / PT ECSE Setting	274	3.55%	375	4.67%	486	5.40%																																																																																												
Residential Facility	4	0.05%	7	0.09%	9	0.10%																																																																																												
Total Early Childhood:	7,725	100.00%	8,036	100.00%	9,007	100.00%																																																																																												
	Missouri	50 States, DC and PR*																																																																																																
Early Childhood Setting	43.47	36.14																																																																																																
Early Childhood Special Education Setting	36.90	34.01																																																																																																
Home	3.39	3.64																																																																																																
PT Early Childhood/Special Education Setting	1.08	12.86																																																																																																
Residential Facility	0.02	0.14																																																																																																
Separate School	4.39	4.39																																																																																																
Itinerant Services Outside Home	10.76	7.13																																																																																																
Reverse Mainstream	-	1.69																																																																																																

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																																								
EC.1.4: Concluded	<div>ECSE Web Application Summary</div> <table><tr><td></td><td>FY00</td><td>FY01</td><td>FY02</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">Staff FTE</td></tr><tr><td>ECSE Itinerant/Traveling Teacher</td><td>49.50</td><td>54.66</td><td>64.67</td></tr><tr><td>Speech/Language Therapist, Traveling</td><td>20.48</td><td>46.38</td><td>65.59</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">Number of Children with IEPs Served</td></tr><tr><td>ECSE Itinerant/Traveling Teacher</td><td>747</td><td>824</td><td>946</td></tr><tr><td>Speech/Language Therapist, Traveling</td><td>854</td><td>1,087</td><td>1,540</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">Average Caseload</td></tr><tr><td>ECSE Itinerant/Traveling Teacher</td><td>15.1</td><td>15.1</td><td>14.6</td></tr><tr><td>Speech/Language Therapist, Traveling</td><td>41.7</td><td>23.4</td><td>23.5</td></tr></table> <div>Committee Conclusions:</div> <p>Based upon input from the committee and Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) staff, it is believed that the interpretation of the placement descriptions varies from district to district to the point that a reliable conclusion cannot be reached from the state reported 618 data. However there has not been a significant change in placement numbers or percentages over the years reported above.</p> <p>The Group ECSE services in an integrated setting vary widely in the amount of integration with typically developing peers. Some classroom typically developing children enrolled on a full-time basis. Others integrate with typically developing students on a routine basis. Others integrate with peers in social situations outside the classroom environment while others have limited interaction with typically developing peers.</p> <p>The ECSE Web Application data shows an increase in the number of itinerant teachers as well as the number of children served by itinerant teachers.</p> <p>We need to compare the December 1 child count numbers to mid-year and end-of-year reporting on the Early Childhood Web Application.</p>		FY00	FY01	FY02	Staff FTE				ECSE Itinerant/Traveling Teacher	49.50	54.66	64.67	Speech/Language Therapist, Traveling	20.48	46.38	65.59	Number of Children with IEPs Served				ECSE Itinerant/Traveling Teacher	747	824	946	Speech/Language Therapist, Traveling	854	1,087	1,540	Average Caseload				ECSE Itinerant/Traveling Teacher	15.1	15.1	14.6	Speech/Language Therapist, Traveling	41.7	23.4	23.5
	FY00	FY01	FY02																																						
Staff FTE																																									
ECSE Itinerant/Traveling Teacher	49.50	54.66	64.67																																						
Speech/Language Therapist, Traveling	20.48	46.38	65.59																																						
Number of Children with IEPs Served																																									
ECSE Itinerant/Traveling Teacher	747	824	946																																						
Speech/Language Therapist, Traveling	854	1,087	1,540																																						
Average Caseload																																									
ECSE Itinerant/Traveling Teacher	15.1	15.1	14.6																																						
Speech/Language Therapist, Traveling	41.7	23.4	23.5																																						

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																																													
<p>EC.1.5: How can we determine the cost vs. effectiveness of each model?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">ECSE estimated cost per child	<p>Data Summary:</p> <table><tr><th colspan="5">ECSE Estimated Cost per Child</th></tr><tr><th>School Year</th><th>Total Cost*</th><th>Child Count Ages 3EC-5EC**</th><th>Average Cost per Child</th><th>Percentage Increase</th></tr><tr><td>2001-2002</td><td>\$85,193,819</td><td>9,005</td><td>\$9,461</td><td>2.9%</td></tr><tr><td>2000-2001</td><td>\$73,633,029</td><td>8,010</td><td>\$9,193</td><td>10.7%</td></tr><tr><td>1999-2000</td><td>\$63,808,620</td><td>7,687</td><td>\$8,301</td><td>2.5%</td></tr><tr><td>1998-1999</td><td>\$56,074,632</td><td>6,924</td><td>\$8,099</td><td>8.1%</td></tr><tr><td>1997-1998</td><td>\$49,125,980</td><td>6,558</td><td>\$7,491</td><td>6.5%</td></tr><tr><td>1996-1997</td><td>\$43,503,904</td><td>6,184</td><td>\$7,035</td><td>10.5%</td></tr><tr><td>1995-1996</td><td>\$38,526,944</td><td>6,050</td><td>\$6,368</td><td></td></tr></table> <p>*Total Cost for 2001-2002 is estimated.</p> <p>**ECSE Child Count includes only those children reported as 3-5 years old with an ECSE placement.</p> <p>The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) summarized some data on a sampling of twelve districts whose '98-'99 per child costs were less than \$8,000 and ten whose costs were greater than 8,000. The tables include the district name, percent of children in ECSE Classrooms, Reverse mainstream classroom, ECSE/Title I classroom, Itinerant services, Sensory impaired Classroom, Speech/Language only, and contractual, as well as the approved budget cost per child and child Count.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>Based on the data reviewed, the average cost per child has increased about 40 percent from 1995 to 2000. It was difficult to form any conclusions from the data, and effectiveness was not reported. The committee did not feel the cost per child data was completely accurate because it was based on December 1 numbers, and those numbers always increase by the end of the year.</p> <p>In order to do a cost/effectiveness analysis, we would need the cost per model as well as student outcome data to draw conclusions about effectiveness.</p>	ECSE Estimated Cost per Child					School Year	Total Cost*	Child Count Ages 3EC-5EC**	Average Cost per Child	Percentage Increase	2001-2002	\$85,193,819	9,005	\$9,461	2.9%	2000-2001	\$73,633,029	8,010	\$9,193	10.7%	1999-2000	\$63,808,620	7,687	\$8,301	2.5%	1998-1999	\$56,074,632	6,924	\$8,099	8.1%	1997-1998	\$49,125,980	6,558	\$7,491	6.5%	1996-1997	\$43,503,904	6,184	\$7,035	10.5%	1995-1996	\$38,526,944	6,050	\$6,368	
ECSE Estimated Cost per Child																																														
School Year	Total Cost*	Child Count Ages 3EC-5EC**	Average Cost per Child	Percentage Increase																																										
2001-2002	\$85,193,819	9,005	\$9,461	2.9%																																										
2000-2001	\$73,633,029	8,010	\$9,193	10.7%																																										
1999-2000	\$63,808,620	7,687	\$8,301	2.5%																																										
1998-1999	\$56,074,632	6,924	\$8,099	8.1%																																										
1997-1998	\$49,125,980	6,558	\$7,491	6.5%																																										
1996-1997	\$43,503,904	6,184	\$7,035	10.5%																																										
1995-1996	\$38,526,944	6,050	\$6,368																																											

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																										
<p>EC.1.6: Are the current caseload parameters adequate for establishing appropriate staffing?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current ECSE caseload standards • Revised State Plan section on caseload standards • Input from ECSE CIMP cluster • Alternative caseload standards in the current Missouri State Plan for Special Education 	<p>Data Summary:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="856 293 1770 824"> <caption>Current Caseload Parameters for ECSE funding</caption> <tr><td>Teachers (center-based)</td><td>12-22</td></tr> <tr><td>Paraprofessionals</td><td>12-22</td></tr> <tr><td>Teacher of Integrated class</td><td>12-20</td></tr> <tr><td>Itinerant teacher traveling</td><td>12-30</td></tr> <tr><td>Itinerant teacher non-traveling</td><td>31-50</td></tr> <tr><td>Diagnostic staff</td><td>1 per 160 children in ECSE for each position</td></tr> <tr><td>Related service staff</td><td>45-50</td></tr> <tr><td>Administrator</td><td>1 per 200 children in ECSE</td></tr> <tr><td>Secretary</td><td>1 per 200 children in ECSE</td></tr> <tr><td>Nurse</td><td>1 per 175 children in ECSE</td></tr> <tr><td>Social worker (general)</td><td>1 per 175 children in ECSE</td></tr> <tr><td>Diagnostic</td><td>1 per 160 children in ECSE</td></tr> <tr><td>Related services</td><td>1 per 50 children in ECSE</td></tr> </table> <p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>The committee felt the ECSE teacher caseload standards were fairly adequate because they take into account traveling as well as school-based models. Caseloads for related services providers are not adjusted for travel time, severity of disabilities or the amount of service provided. This becomes a problem as more and more itinerant services are provided. DESE Supervisors consider requests for caseload exceptions when rationale is provided, so there is some flexibility in applying exceptions.</p> <p>The committee suggests using the alternative caseload chart for related services staff on an informational basis by a sampling of districts. Districts could be selected based on size and location and asked to provide comparison data using current caseload parameters and the alternative caseload chart.</p>	Teachers (center-based)	12-22	Paraprofessionals	12-22	Teacher of Integrated class	12-20	Itinerant teacher traveling	12-30	Itinerant teacher non-traveling	31-50	Diagnostic staff	1 per 160 children in ECSE for each position	Related service staff	45-50	Administrator	1 per 200 children in ECSE	Secretary	1 per 200 children in ECSE	Nurse	1 per 175 children in ECSE	Social worker (general)	1 per 175 children in ECSE	Diagnostic	1 per 160 children in ECSE	Related services	1 per 50 children in ECSE
Teachers (center-based)	12-22																										
Paraprofessionals	12-22																										
Teacher of Integrated class	12-20																										
Itinerant teacher traveling	12-30																										
Itinerant teacher non-traveling	31-50																										
Diagnostic staff	1 per 160 children in ECSE for each position																										
Related service staff	45-50																										
Administrator	1 per 200 children in ECSE																										
Secretary	1 per 200 children in ECSE																										
Nurse	1 per 175 children in ECSE																										
Social worker (general)	1 per 175 children in ECSE																										
Diagnostic	1 per 160 children in ECSE																										
Related services	1 per 50 children in ECSE																										

COMPONENT EC.2: Identify supports (training, technical assistance, policy) needed to increase the use of community preschool settings and district operated preschool programs.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>EC.2.1: What are the districts' perceived needs to encourage and help them use community preschool options?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<p>Data Summary: No Data</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: No conclusions could be drawn. Technical assistance and staffing support (provisions for meaningful, ongoing training and technical assistance) are needed to expand the implementation of ECSE services in community settings. Strategies for providing staff development need to be explored – e.g. consider some of the models used with First Steps (Train the Trainer, Facilitators located in regions of the state who are available to local districts). It would be helpful to build local capacity and have trained individuals available who understand and can provide technical assistance on the use of the itinerant model.</p> <p>Surveys are needed to collect ideas and suggestions from administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents for supports that would assist in providing itinerant services. Surveys could target districts with minimal itinerant or early childhood options and could also gather ideas from districts that utilize a wide array of placement options. A task force of itinerant teachers could help define implementation of itinerant models across the state and create long-term plans for technical assistance and support for itinerant teachers. These groups could explore what types of training are provided to inclusion coordinators for Child Care Resource and Referral offices and other resources.</p>
<p>EC.2.2: What are some effective practice examples from other states and current literature sources on the use of itinerant services and supports to increase inclusion of preschool children with disabilities in “regular” preschool settings?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various examples of effective practices 	<p>Data Summary: A thorough review has not been completed at this time, however the following sources have been compiled:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preschool Inclusion (Claire C. Caballaro), • An Administrator’s Guide to Preschool Inclusion (Ruth Ashworth Wolery & Samuel L. Odom) • Early Childhood Inclusion (Michael J. Guralnick) • NECTAS web site • Frank Porter Graham Child Development Program Web site • State of Vermont web site on inclusion (Michael Shawn Grecco) <p>Committee Conclusions: There are numerous articles in the literature regarding inclusion with examples from other states. Some of this information may be valuable as DESE plans future training and technical assistance. DESE needs additional examples of effective practices from other states related to using itinerant services and supports to include children with disabilities in community preschool settings. At this point, nothing has been discovered by the committee as strategic models that Missouri should adopt.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>EC.2.3: What support has been provided by DESE and other State agencies to enhance collaboration and encourage the use of community settings for providing individualized education program (IEP) services?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the General Education Curriculum – Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) for ECSE • Autism – Project Access • Assistive Technology • Blind Skills Specialists • Center for Innovations in Education • ECSE Practices Manual • ECSE Show Me How Technical Assistance Bulletins • First Steps Modules (Part C) – Module 4 Movin’ On • First Steps Bulletins • Heads Up Reading • Leadership Series – Compliance, Compliance and Data, Data, Funds • Leadership Series – Visually Impaired Level 2 • Learning to Develop Measurable Goals, Objectives and Benchmarks • Mentoring for Success of Students with Disabilities (Grants and Manual) Resource Document 	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p>The following data sources were reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing Effective Practices published by DESE in June 2000 with information from the 1998-99 school year • DESE Technical Assistance documents • “Understanding Early Childhood LRE Requirements” • “Another ECSE Service Delivery Model Choice: Learning on the Go: ECSE Services in the Community” • “Head Start/Early Childhood Special Education Partnerships” • Technical assistance article from DESE “Cooperative Early Childhood Programs” Revised September, 2000 • Head Start – DESE Memorandum of Agreement (draft – 2001) • Information on numerous childcare initiatives as listed on the web site for Map to Inclusive Child Care for Missouri. The list includes, but is not limited to: Special Needs Child Care Task Force, Child Day Care Association’s First Steps Project, Child Care Resource and Referral Enhanced Project, Show Me Rainbows training, Missouri Tikes training • Circle of Inclusion training was provided in the early 1990s to several large school districts in Missouri, e.g. Francis Howell

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>EC.2.3: Concluded</p> <p>Related CSPD: Concluded</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missouri School for the Blind Outreach • Missouri School for the Deaf Outreach • Missouri Teacher Certification Requirements • Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs (MoSTEP) • New Scripts Early Intervention/ Early Childhood Systems Change in Personnel Preparation • Orientation and Mobility Certification • Paraprofessional Core Manual • Parents Role Brochures • Parents as Teachers: Supporting Families of Children with Special Needs Guide and Training • Perspectives on Emotional and Behavior Disorders • Priority Schools • Quality Eligibility Decisions • School Psychologist Intern Project • Traumatic Brain Injury • Tuition Reimbursement 	<p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>Head Start preschool programs have been available in Missouri for many years. Through collaboration encouraged by the state Memorandum of Agreement between Head Start and DESE, Head Start is being utilized as a location for the provision of services for children with IEPs. Local Head Starts are required to execute Memorandums of Agreement with local districts.</p> <p>Each Child Care Resource and Referral office has an Inclusion Coordinator to assist families in locating childcare and to facilitate placement. The Coordinator also trains and supports childcare providers regarding children with disabilities.</p> <p>DESE has published numerous Technical Assistance documents on topics related to inclusion and has disseminated them to school districts' ECSE administrators. The committee discussed the fact that there have been a number of interagency initiatives in recent years to train and support childcare providers to enable and encourage them to serve children with disabilities, however DESE has not provided a great deal of ongoing systematic training or technical assistance to school districts on providing services in the least restrictive environment. DESE is planning to provide training on ECSE in the Least Restrictive Environment. Target date for the training is Spring 2003.</p> <p>"Sharing Effective Practices" provides numerous examples of ways Districts have utilized Head Start, Title I, tuition based preschools, and community preschools in their areas</p>

COMPONENT EC.3: Recommendations for Policy/Regulations to ensure high quality ECSE services.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>EC.3.1: What do we know from research/other states about indicators for highly effective programs?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Early Childhood Inclusion</u>, Michael Guralnick, Chapter 1, "Framework For Change" • <u>Building Strong Foundations for Early Learning</u> U.S. Department of Education's Guide to High-Quality Early Childhood Education Programs • NAEYC Guidelines Revision – July 2001 	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p>Michael Guralnick's information pointed out the importance of a number of factors such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of inclusive programs in the community • Maximum participation with typically developing children in typical activities • Meeting individualized needs without disrupting the integrity of the program's model • Meaningful social relationships between children with and without disabilities <p>Guralnick stated that children would do at least as well developmentally and socially in inclusive programs as they do in specialized programs.</p> <p><u>Building Strong Foundations for Early Learning:</u> Key Indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of parent involvement including home literacy environment and parent-child interactions • Quality of the learning environment (class size, teacher ratio, safe secure classrooms, rich literacy environment, accommodation of children with special needs) • Quality of early childhood pedagogy (variety of domains and structures, individualization, learning how to think) • Quality of early childhood curricula (planning, language foundation, emergent literacy, mathematics and science foundations for problem solving) • Quality of early childhood staff (degree and certification, professional development, professional working conditions) • Quality of assessment (variety of assessment procedures that are embedded in instruction on an ongoing basis, including observation, performance assessment, work samples, etc.) <p><u>NAEYC Guidelines Revision</u> – Standards for Early Childhood Professional Preparation (Pre-service)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting child development and learning • Building family and community relationships • Observing, documenting and assessing to support young children and families • Teaching and learning (includes connecting with children and families, using developmentally effective approaches, understanding content knowledge in early education, building meaningful curriculum) • Becoming a professional (on-going reflection and professional development and use of ethical guidelines and professional standards)

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																								
EC.3.1: Concluded	<p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>Some common threads were evident, including the importance of curricula, developmentally appropriate practices, parent collaboration, qualified staff (certification and expertise available to meet individual child needs), and maximum participation with typically developing peers.</p> <p>More specific information is needed from a sampling of states regarding effective programs and specifically how they have measured effectiveness.</p>																								
EC.3.2: What do we know about child outcomes in Missouri?	<p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">School Entry Assessment Project <p>Data Summary:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">School Entry Profile* FY2000</p> <table><tr><th></th><th>Special Education Only</th><th>Special Education & PAT & Preschool</th></tr><tr><td>Preparation for Kindergarten</td><td>91.2</td><td>98.8</td></tr><tr><td>Conventional Knowledge</td><td>90.8</td><td>96.8</td></tr><tr><td>Learning to Learn</td><td>86.3</td><td>95.8</td></tr><tr><td>Working with Others</td><td>85.8</td><td>96.1</td></tr><tr><td>Mathematical/Physical Knowledge</td><td>85.1</td><td>96.1</td></tr><tr><td>Communication</td><td>88.8</td><td>95.9</td></tr><tr><td>Symbolic Development</td><td>88.1</td><td>95.4</td></tr></table> <p>*The mean standardized scale score is 100 with a standard deviation of 15.</p> <p>According to the School Entry Profile, children who receive special education prior to kindergarten score approximately one forth standard deviation below the average child. Children who participate in special education only (no other preschool experience, e.g. PAT< Head Start) score significantly lower (three quarters standard deviation) than the average special education child in symbolic development, mathematical/physical knowledge, and conventional knowledge.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>Data suggests that Special Education programs are most effective when combined with other programs such as PAT and preschool, however the committee did not feel they could reach meaningful conclusions about child outcomes based on this data. The School Entry Assessment provides subjective data, as the teacher is asked to rate the child as always, sometimes or never on the usage of various skills. There are so many different categories of types of preschool experiences that it was difficult to determine which type was most effective; the numbers in each category are small. There is not a pre-test and a post-test. A review of the School Entry Assessment Project is needed to determine if it is appropriate for use with ECSE students on a more comprehensive basis statewide. DESE should establish guidance on quality indicators for ECSE services. They could adopt or adapt something similar to Building Strong Foundations. More information is needed on the outcomes of Missouri children who have participated in ECSE.</p>		Special Education Only	Special Education & PAT & Preschool	Preparation for Kindergarten	91.2	98.8	Conventional Knowledge	90.8	96.8	Learning to Learn	86.3	95.8	Working with Others	85.8	96.1	Mathematical/Physical Knowledge	85.1	96.1	Communication	88.8	95.9	Symbolic Development	88.1	95.4
	Special Education Only	Special Education & PAT & Preschool																							
Preparation for Kindergarten	91.2	98.8																							
Conventional Knowledge	90.8	96.8																							
Learning to Learn	86.3	95.8																							
Working with Others	85.8	96.1																							
Mathematical/Physical Knowledge	85.1	96.1																							
Communication	88.8	95.9																							
Symbolic Development	88.1	95.4																							

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION														
<p>EC.3.3: What early childhood curricula are being used in Missouri school districts with ECSE eligible children? (How many districts do not use a specific curriculum?)</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharing Effective Practices DESE, 1998-1999 School Year 	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Early Childhood Curricula Summary</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="753 323 1866 578"> <tr> <th>Curriculums Utilized</th><th>Districts</th></tr> <tr> <td>Project Construct</td><td>25</td></tr> <tr> <td>Creative Curriculum</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr> <td>High Scope</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>Carolina Curriculum</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>A variety of approaches including play-based, thematic units and activity-based interventions</td><td>42</td></tr> <tr> <td>Total</td><td>75</td></tr> </table> <p>Committee Conclusions: The sample was small, and there was not enough data to draw conclusions. More information is needed on curricula used for preschool aged children throughout Missouri</p>	Curriculums Utilized	Districts	Project Construct	25	Creative Curriculum	5	High Scope	2	Carolina Curriculum	1	A variety of approaches including play-based, thematic units and activity-based interventions	42	Total	75
Curriculums Utilized	Districts														
Project Construct	25														
Creative Curriculum	5														
High Scope	2														
Carolina Curriculum	1														
A variety of approaches including play-based, thematic units and activity-based interventions	42														
Total	75														
<p>EC.3.4: Should Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) require that school districts utilize specific curriculum for ECSE?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Input from ECSE CIP Cluster Show-Me How Technical Assistance Bulletin Choosing Preschool Curriculum, January, 1998 	<p>Data Summary: DESE disseminated a (January 1998) Technical Assistance Bulletin for Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) that provided a recommended list of curricula for preschool age children. Districts are encouraged to adopt a general education curriculum and to adapt it to meet the individual needs of the child by keeping the curriculum in line with IEP goals and objectives.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: It is not possible to tell the extent of the use of curriculum recommended by DESE.</p>														

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>EC.3.5: How do parents rate their child's ECSE services, including transition from First Steps?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• First Steps Forum (6/99) Parent Surveys upon Exiting First Steps	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Parent Survey Data</p> <p>52 percent of the 73 parents surveyed indicated that transition to ECSE was a positive experience. 53 percent attended an IEP meeting prior to their child turning 3. 62 percent understood their rights through the transition process. 48 percent felt their child received the necessary services through the public school ECSE program. 41 percent visited programs prior to IEP.</p> <p>Committee Conclusion:</p> <p>We don't have adequate information to draw conclusions at this time. The family survey represented a small number of respondents. More information is needed on parent perceptions of ECSE services.</p>

COMPONENT EC.4: Recommendations for ways DESE can support the continuous professional development of ECSE staff in districts through a process of continuous needs assessment that uses multiple sources of information including perceived needs, problem areas identified and Department/Division goals.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>EC.4.1: How are school district ECSE staff development needs determined?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input from ECSE CIMP cluster committee 	<p>Data Summary: The professional development committees are charged with conducting a needs assessment at the district level for the use of district professional development funds. Many districts survey the ECSE staff for their input on their needs. Typically, in-service is provided through ECSE staff as opposed to other district personnel.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: The information gathered was from informal and anecdotal sources. Although the groups surveyed or polled were small, the topics listed as perceived needs for training were fairly consistent from group to group. There was not adequate information to draw any conclusions. A wider sample of perceived needs is needed from district administrators and teachers related to staff development practices for ECSE. A systematic method for continuously assessing the training needs of ECSE staff could be developed.</p>
<p>EC.4.2: What are districts doing to train new teachers and/or substitutes?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input from ECSE CIMP cluster committee <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the General Education Curriculum – Least Restrictive Environment for ECSE • Autism – Project Access • Assistive Technology • Blind Skills Specialists • Center for Innovations in Education • ECSE Practices Manual • ECSE Show Me How Technical Assistance Bulletins • Heads Up Reading 	<p>Data Summary: Anecdotal evidence suggests that there is little or no specific training for new ECSE teachers and substitute teachers aside from what is done for the rest of the teaching staff. Training does include information about special education process, writing IEPs, using district forms and procedures and making classroom modifications. Training varies based on size and resources of districts.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>EC.4.2: Concluded</p> <p>Related CSPD: Concluded</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership Series – Visually Impaired Level 2 • Learning to Develop Measurable Goals, Objectives and Benchmarks • Mentoring for Success of Students with Disabilities (Grants and Manual) Resource Document • Missouri Teacher Certification Requirements • Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs (MoSTEP) • New Scripts Early Intervention/ Early Childhood Systems Change in Personnel Preparation • Orientation and Mobility Certification • Paraprofessional Core Manual • Perspectives on Emotional and Behavior Disorders • Quality Eligibility Decisions • School Psychologist Intern Project • Traumatic Brain Injury • Tuition Reimbursement 	<p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>A variety of professional development is available. The information gathered was from informal and anecdotal sources. Although the groups surveyed or polled were small, the topics listed as perceived needs for training were fairly consistent from group to group. No definitive conclusions could be drawn.</p> <p>Information on the new ECSE LRE training can be found in the Appendix.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>EC.4.3: What are the needs for training in Missouri school districts and how can DESE set goals for training?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal survey of ECSE CIMP committee and ECSE Partnership group • Monitoring data • School Entry Assessment data • DESE Strategic Plan 	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p>Perceived training needs were gathered from a variety of sources but were very similar. They included: Transition from Part C to Part B and from ECSE to kindergarten; Special Education Process including procedural safeguards, evaluation, diagnosis/eligibility criteria, LRE, placement, service delivery options, writing IEP/reports; specific information about disabilities and needs of specific children; Positive Behavioral Supports.</p> <p>Missouri monitoring data related to ECSE is limited. DESE monitors in the area of transition from Part C and specifically these items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEP is in place by third birthday for First Steps transition • IEP is implemented as soon as possible following IEP meeting <p>A very small percentage of districts were out of compliance on the above items in 1999, 2000 or 2001.</p> <p>School Entry Assessment data was reported in Indicator EC.3.2.</p> <p>The new DESE strategic plan includes one Key Outcome specifically related to Early Childhood: Increased percentage of children entering school ready to succeed. Related Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase from 47 to 60 percent the number of families with pre-kindergarten children who participate in parent education and related support services, by 2005. • Increase the availability of school-based DESE supported quality care and education services for children ages three to five by 8 percent by 2005. • Increase from 78-86 percent the number of public school kindergartners attending full day programs, by 2005. <p>Evaluation data from participants in DESE training does not show numbers of participants who are ECSE staff or break down their comments and recommendations accordingly.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
EC.4.3: Conclusion	<p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>Although we don't have extensive data, there appear to be some consistent themes when various groups are questioned about training needs.</p> <p>Monitoring issues related to ECSE do not appear significant at this time, but there are not many that can be disaggregated for ECSE services.</p> <p>The School Entry Assessment data does not provide enough information to draw conclusions related to training needs in Missouri.</p> <p>The most applicable outcome for ECSE in the Strategic Plan is related to increasing the availability of care and education services. This could benefit children and districts as they attempt to increase services in the least restrictive environment. The committee is not aware of any goals or priorities that have been established specifically for ECSE – e.g. increase the level of services in settings designed primarily for children without disabilities.</p> <p>We could not form any conclusions from the training evaluation data. Better data is needed on the level of participation and needs reported by ECSE staff attending DESE training.</p>